REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the telephone interview conducted between the Examiner and Applicant's representative on October 13, 2005.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-25, 32, 40, and 41 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 12, 18, 32, 40, and 41 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

§112 Rejection of Claims 1-25, 32, 40, and 41

In Section 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-25, 32, 40, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 12, 18, 32, 40, and 41 have been amended to address the rejection.

For example, the steps of fingerprinting method claim 1, as presented herein, includes:

receiving a plurality of master datasets, each master dataset divided into a plurality of input segments,

wherein at least one master dataset of said plurality of master datasets is uniquely marked; and

producing an output dataset having a plurality of output segments, each output segment of said output dataset generated by:

selecting a corresponding input segment from one of said plurality of master datasets; and inserting said selected corresponding input segment into said each output segment,

wherein the arrangement of said plurality of output segments in said output dataset as a result of selecting input segments from said plurality of master datasets provides fingerprinting of said output

dataset such that the number of output segments in said output dataset is equal to the number of input segments in each master dataset."

(emphasis added)

Accordingly, in one aspect of claim 1, the arrangement of output segments in the output dataset, as a result of selecting input segments from the master datasets, provides fingerprinting of the output dataset such that the number of output segments in the output dataset is equal to the number of input segments in each master dataset.

Therefore, claim 1 should now be allowable. Since independent claims 12, 18, 32, 40, and 41 have been similarly amended, claims 12, 18, 32, 40, and 41 should also be allowable. Further, since claims 2-25 depend from one of claims 1, 12, and 18, claims 2-25 should also be allowable.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1-25, 32, 40, and 41 based upon 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§112 Rejection of Claims 1-25, 32, 40, and 41

In Section 8 of the Office Action, claims 1-25, 32, 40, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 12, 18, 32, 40, and 41 have been amended to address the rejection.

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claims 1-25, 32, 40, and 41, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1-25, 32, 40, and 41 based upon 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Objections to Claims 1-25, 32, 40, and 41

In Section 9 of the Office Action, claims 1-25, 32, 40, and 41 stand objected to.

Independent claims 1, 12, 18, 32, 40, and 41 have been amended to address the rejection.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the objection of claims 1-25, 32, 40, and 41 has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 1-25, 32, 40, and 41 are respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes that have been made to these claims were not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes were made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:

Samuel 8. Lee Reg. No. 42,791 (858) 731-5018